

REMARKS

The Office Action dated August 20, 2007 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1, 3-12, 20 and 34-46 are pending in this application, and claims 13-19 and 21-33 are withdrawn. By this amendment, claims 1, 34 and 35 are amended. Support for the subject matter of the amendments to the claims can be found in the specification at, for example, paragraph [0033]. Reconsideration of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested.

The courtesy extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Patel during the telephone interview held October 29, 2007, are gratefully appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 3-12, 20 and 34-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Kimball ("Track your department budgets, commitments, and actuals with a dimensional model"; June 1, 1999) in view of Enzweiler ("The sizzle in client/server systems;" Management Accounting Journal, Vol. 77, No. 8, pages 22-30; February 1996), and further in view of Heimermann (U.S. Patent No. 7,110,976). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the interview with Examiner Patel, none of the applied references disclose or suggest a method and associated system that includes creating a budget for a transaction, the budget including a total price and at least one line item, each line item including an approved work order price, wherein one or more of the line

items is created via a bidding process among a plurality of vendors, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 34 and 35.

Thus, independent claims 1, 34 and 35 are patentable over the applied references. Claims 3-12, 20 and 36-46, at least for their dependence on patentable claims 1 and 35, and for their added limitations, are also patentable over the combination of the applied references.

For at least these reasons, claims 1, 3-12, 20 and 34-46 are patentable over the combination of all of the applied references. Thus, withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

With respect to withdrawn claims 13-19 and 21-33, the amendment to claims 1 and 35 remove the asserted distinction between the sub-combinations indicated in the September 23, 2005 Restriction Requirement. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request rejoinder of withdrawn claims 13-19 and 21-33.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application into better form, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing Attorney Dkt. No. 026083-00005.**

Respectfully submitted,



Tarik M. Nabi
Registration Number 55,478

Attachement: Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-638-4810

TMN